

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONDALISA LEGRAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES,

Defendant.

Case No. [22-cv-05815-TSH](#)

**ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER
ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIAL
SHOULD BE SEALED**

Re: Dkt. No. 193

Plaintiff Condalisa LeGrand has filed an administrative motion to consider whether another party's material should be sealed. ECF No. 193. Defendant Abbott Laboratories has filed a response indicating it does not seek to seal Exhibits 1 and 2 to the Supplemental Declaration of Melanie R. Monroe in Support of Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Class Certification. ECF No. 198. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** as to these exhibits. As Abbott has already filed these exhibits in the public record (ECF Nos. 198-1 & 198-2), no further action is required as to them.

As for the proposed renewed motion, the Court has already determined this information should be sealed. *See* ECF No. 175. Plaintiff does not challenge the Court's prior Order, and Defendant maintains that such information should remain under seal because it reveals non-public information about its business strategy related to marketing of its Ensure products and its market research and analysis. *See id.*; ECF No. 198. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion as to the proposed renewed motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2025


THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge